

The instant reissue application adds new claims 8-11 in which claim 8 is the independent claim. A review of independent claim 8 indicates that claim 8 does not recite the limitations of claim 5. Thus claim 8 is broader than the patent claim 1, and the claim is broader in aspects relating to subject matters during the original prosecution.

As indicated under MPEP 1402 one of the reasons for reissue is, if applicant believes his claims are too narrow. If one looks at the prosecution history including the original claims as well as all the amendments, it will be seen that a claim such as 8 in this reissue has never been in the case and has thus never been rejected on prior art. The features in Claim 8 are based on the original disclosure beginning with Fig. 2, col. 3 line 19-36 and the Fig's 2 and 3 of the drawings. What is claimed in Claim 8 of the Reissue that is different and broader is d) wherein the sleeve is substantially in the form of a cylinder, unlike the claim 1 of the patent which claims a sleeve in the form of a funnel.


Additionally MPEP 1412.02 states that reissue claims broader in certain aspects and narrower in others vis-a vis claims canceled from the original application to obtain a patent may avoid the effect of the recapture rule if the claims are broader in a way that does not attempt to recapture what was surrendered earlier. For example, compare added claim 8 in the original application that was canceled with Claim 8 in the Reissue. In Claim 8 of the original application the claim recited a metal press sleeve connector, but the claim 8 of the Reissue defined the metal press sleeve connector more narrowly as a cylinder having spaced indents. On the other hand claim 8 of the original application recited dimensions of the sleeve and the conductor which is narrower than the reissue claim 8.

In summation contrary to the Examiner's argument, it is perfectly legitimate to recite a broader claim in a reissue if applicant believes there is a basis in the specification for such claim and applicant is not trying to recapture a previously canceled claim. For all the above reasons, it is believed this case is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are earnestly requested.

Respectfully,

Wayne Robinson, Applicant

By: Robert Halper



Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 30,536